
CATALYST

A Publication of the Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention
Funded by the U.S. Department of Education

Vol. 1, No. 4

Winter 1996

Student Athletes and Alcohol and Other Drug Use

by Joel Epstein, J.D.

The Higher Education Center For Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention

The Problem

Many college and university administrators are concerned about alcohol and other drug (AOD) use among student athletes. According to researchers, students athletes often feel more pressure to perform both inside and outside the classroom than the general student population.¹ In addition to striving to excel athletically, academically, and socially, athletes may experience stress due to isolated living conditions in athletic residence halls and long hours spent practicing, training, and traveling.² Some athletes may turn to drugs and alcohol in an attempt to cope with these multiple demands. Insecurity about identity and self-image, an intense fear of failure, fear of aggression (where aggression, an inherent aspect of most college sports, is confused with violence), and peer pressure are other factors that may incline an athlete to substance abuse.³

A recent comparison of alcohol use and attitudes among college athletes and nonathletes, found no evidence that alcohol and other drug use is higher among college athletes than the rest of the student population.⁴ Nevertheless, there are many reasons why an athletic department should be spending time and resources to develop an AOD prevention program. Dr. Susan Grossman, Associate Director for Prevention Programs at the Institute for Substance Abuse Studies at the University of Virginia, notes that athletes are less likely than other college students to turn to professionals in their university or community for help with problems, including substance abuse problems.⁵ Other reasons for paying particular attention to student athletes include:

- Student athletes are significant role models for many of their fellow students. As a result, if athletes drink or use other drugs they may encourage other students to engage in the behavior by helping to establish a school norm that alcohol and other drug use is acceptable, even desirable, behavior.
- Some studies suggest that intoxicated student athletes may commit a disproportionate number of sexual assaults on some campuses. Nationwide, one percent of nonathlete students who were heavy drinkers reported having committed acquaintance rape, but five times as many student athletes — 5 percent of 217 athletes — admitted to this crime.⁶

Many schools now make AOD education a mandatory part of freshman orientation. However, these programs usually provide only basic information about AOD and general information about institutional policies. It is doubtful that this has much lasting effect on athletes in light of the rigorous, time-consuming training schedules they follow.⁷ Dr. Grossman refers to these programs as the “shotgun” approach in which a great deal of information is tossed out to the student population at large in the hope that it will “hit” someone. Even mandatory lectures by guest speakers, such as recovering professional athletes, are often not effective at reaching the college athlete.

The National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) suggests drug testing as a deterrent to drug use by athletes. In addition to its drug-testing program, the NCAA produces a variety of drug education materials including videotapes, brochures, and posters to help member institutions and athletic conferences develop effective drug use prevention programs.

continued on page 2 . . .

In this issue:

Student Athletes and Alcohol and Other Drug Use . . . 1

The Drug-Free School and Campuses Act . . . 3

AOD Prevention at Historically Black College and Universities . . . 5

Nationwide Search for Promising Programs . . . 8

Peer Education: A More Effective Approach

Having student athletes serve as peer AOD prevention educators may be a more effective means of reaching athletes than other methods of prevention education.

Student Athlete Mentors—The SAM Program

College athletes as a whole are more frequently in close contact with their own teammates than with other students, and it is this group that usually forms the basis of their social group and the group with whom they live. As a result, in order to influence the AOD behavior of individual athletes it is important to try to have an impact on the team as a whole.

Established in 1989, the Student Athlete Mentors (SAM) program is a student-staffed, peer-education model designed primarily as a means of providing AOD prevention information to University of Virginia (UVA) student athletes. The purpose of SAM is to establish and maintain a safe, encouraging, and supportive environment within the student athlete population. Some 60 trained SAMs work with athletic teams each year serving 650 male and female student athletes representing 21 varsity sports.

University of Virginia athletic team members elect student athletes they regard as leaders to serve as SAMs. The SAMs then receive special training in how to be internal resources and “prevention specialists” for their respective teams. They also arrange presentations on AOD issues relevant to the team. Student athlete mentors are instructed in how to confront student alcohol and other drug use, sexual assault, academic failure and drinking and driving incidents.

The university’s Institute for Substance Abuse Studies has not only trained athletes in the SAM model but has also recruited members of fraternities, sororities, residence halls, campus clubs, and other student groups to be mentors to their specific peer groups.

The APPLE Model/Conference

The APPLE Model (Athletic Prevention Programming and Leadership Education) is a program developed by Susan Grossman and Joe Gieck of the University of Virginia to help athletic departments develop more effective AOD prevention programs after they have systematically assessed their AOD prevention efforts in seven areas:

- 1) recruitment practices
- 2) expectations and attitudes
- 3) education
- 4) policies
- 5) drug testing
- 6) discipline and
- 7) referral and counseling.

For the past four years the National Collegiate Athletic Association has awarded the University of Virginia annual grants to work with colleges and universities across the country to learn the APPLE Model approach to AOD problem assessment and prevention programming. Since 1991, over 100 schools have attended APPLE workshops in order to improve their AOD prevention policies and programs through careful assessment of their benefits and drawbacks. For the 1995-1996 school year, the NCAA has again made the APPLE program its AOD prevention model, funding UVA to present two conferences, one in the east in mid-January 1996 and one in the west in early February 1996. The east coast conference will be held in Charlottesville, Virginia, and the February meeting will be held in either California or Texas. The University of Virginia has also received a grant from the Office of the Governor to fund a statewide conference on substance abuse for university and college athletes from throughout Virginia.

Grossman and Gieck developed the APPLE Conference and the SAM program in response to what they viewed as the poor quality of AOD peer education models for college athletes. Over the years APPLE evolved into a program of two annual conferences. In order to attend, a school must first conduct the APPLE assessment of its ath-

letic program, taking into consideration the expectations and attitudes of its athletes. Typically, each school participating in the APPLE Conference selects two or three athletes from each team as team representatives. Larger teams, such as the football team, may have as many as five representatives. The conferences are designed to foster a dialogue and create an on-going relationship between a school’s athletic department and athletes.

APPLE peer educators take on a variety of responsibilities. After completing six hours of training in AOD prevention, the team representatives act out a number of enabling scenarios designed to develop their AOD prevention communication skills. Upon returning to their respective schools, team representatives must arrange for a presentation to their team. Ideally, the team representatives are respected student athletes who can credibly promote a responsible behavior message to fellow students. The program’s organizers do not expect they will be able to stop college drinking; rather, they are looking for peer educators who can convey a strong prevention and healthy lifestyles message to the other athletes. According to Clara Colon, Director of the CHEERS prevention program at John Jay College of Criminal Justice in New York City, a group of John Jay student athletes who recently attended the APPLE Conference have returned to the college better suited to act as peer educators in prevention.

Funding AOD Prevention

The Institute for Substance Abuse Studies at the University of Virginia has received several grants for the support of its work.

In the fall of 1990, the Institute for Substance Abuse Studies was started with a two-year \$118,000 FIPSE (Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention Utilizing Strategic Targeted Interventions) grant from the Department of Education. This initial grant helped start SAM—the Students Athletes Mentor Program and the Student Assistant Mentor Program. Prior to the

receipt of the grant, the University of Virginia's Department of Athletics had decided to create a SAM-like program for athletes. The FIPSE grant enabled the newly created Institute for Substance Abuse Studies to hire staff and create programs that targeted both athletes and fraternities and sororities.

Under a two-year National Student Network grant from FIPSE, the Institute is creating the National Student Athlete Association (NASAA), an association that will be opened to all schools with varsity athletics programs and a faculty advisor. Created with a \$265,000 grant which began in September 1994 and ends in October 1996, the association will lend support to student athletes dealing with a range of AOD problems. The association will also assist schools to create and evaluate their prevention programming. The Institute is currently seeking corporate sponsorship for the association for when the seed money runs out. The association's next conference is scheduled for the weekend of April 18, 1996, in Chicago.

All funding for the Apple Model/Conference Program has been provided by the National Collegiate Athletic Program. The \$103,000 grant pays for representatives from NCAA schools to attend one of this year's national APPLE conferences. This year's meetings are scheduled for Charlottesville on January 19-21, 1996, and Dallas on February 2-4, 1996. The Institute seeks to enroll representatives from 30 schools at each of the conferences, which this year will take up the issue of athletes and violence.

For More Information on the APPLE and SAM programs, contact:

Dr. Susan Grossman, Associate
Director for Prevention Programs
Institute for Substance Abuse
Studies
University of Virginia
Blue Ridge Hospital, Box 15
Charlottesville, Va 22901
(804) 924-5276
Email: sjg9h@virginia.edu

Endnotes

1. S.J. Grossman, J. Gieck, A. Freedman, and W.L. Fang, "The Athletic Prevention Programming and Leadership Education (APPLE) Model: Developing Substance Abuse Prevention Programs," *Journal of Athletic Training*, 28(2): 137-144 (1993).
2. R.S. Pinkerton, L.D. Hinz, and J.C. Barrow, "The College Student Athlete: Considerations and Interventions," *Journal of American College Health*, 37:218-226 (1989).
3. H. Martin and D. Thrasher, "Chemical Dependency and Treatment of the Professional Athlete." In G.W. Lawson, ed. *Alcoholism and Substance Abuse in Special Populations* (Rockville, MD: Aspen Publishers): 315-339 (1989).
4. S.J. Overman and T. Terry, "Alcohol Use and Attitudes: A Comparison of College Athletes and nonathletes. *Journal of Drug Education* 21:107-117 (1991).
5. S. J. Grossman and J. Gieck, "A Model Alcohol and Other Drug Peer Education Program for Student Athletes," *Journal of Sport Rehabilitation*, 1:337-349 (1992).
6. R.B. Bausell, C.R. Bausell, and D.G. Siegel, "The Links Among Alcohol, Drugs and Crime on American College Campuses: A National Followup Study." Unpublished report (Towson, MD: Towson State University Campus Violence Prevention Center, 1994).
7. S.J. Grossman, J. Gieck, A. Freedman, and W.L. Fang, "The Athletic Prevention Programming and Leadership Education (APPLE) Model: Developing Substance Abuse Prevention Programs."

The Drug-Free Schools and Campuses Act

Compliance Issues for College and University Administrators

by Donna K. Rigby, Higher Education Center, and
Marilyn Mattsson, Private Consultant,
Baltimore, Maryland

The Drug-Free Schools and Campuses Act, codified as Part 86 of EDGAR (34 CFR Part 86), was

signed into law on December 12, 1989. The act requires colleges and universities to adopt and implement a written policy, distributed annually to all students and employees, that spells out compliance with the act's three main elements concerning alcohol and other drug (AOD) abuse prevention on campus: (1) a written policy, freely available to the public, prohibiting illegal AOD use on campus and including a clear statement of sanctions for violations of the prohibition; (2) annual distribution of the policy to all students and employees on campus; and (3) a written biennial review and evaluation of each school's policy statement, with the findings available upon request.

Introduction

Compliance with Part 86 of EDGAR can be a powerful tool for ensuring the delivery and coordination of AOD-related services and programs for students, faculty, and staff. Non-compliance can result in the withdrawal of all federal funding to the school, including student Pell grants.

The first element of the act, a written policy indicating clearly that illegal AOD use is not acceptable behavior by students and employees of the university and will not be tolerated, has not proven to be a problem for institutions of higher education. Schools were required to submit a one-time certification to the Department of Education by October 1990 signifying that their AOD policy included the following elements:

- standards of conduct that clearly prohibit the unlawful possession, use, or distribution of alcohol and other drugs by students and employees on campus property or at campus activities;
- a description of legal sanctions;
- a description of the health risks associated with the use of illegal drugs and the abuse of alcohol;
- a description of any drug and

continued on page 4 . . .

alcohol counseling, treatment, or rehabilitation services that are available either on campus or in the community; and

- a clear statement that the school will impose sanctions up to and including expulsion or termination for violations of the policy.

All institutions of higher education sent the required certification notice to the Department of Education. None were found to be in non-compliance.

Annual Distribution

The regulations require the policy to be distributed to all students and employees. Simply making the information available is not sufficient. How do you get the policy into the hands of every student without a huge expenditure of money? Once students get the policy, how can you be sure they actually read it? Do you have to distribute the complete policy, or will a shorten version satisfy the requirement? These are some of the most frequently asked questions and some of the most difficult to answer.

For more and more institutions of higher education, creativity seems to be key in cutting distribution costs. For example, Utah State University requires all students to register by computerized voice mail. A student calling to register is immediately asked, "Have you read the school's policy on alcohol and other drugs? If the student answers, "No," registration cannot proceed. Although this procedure can only assume students' veracity, it does send a message that the administration considers their knowledge of the policy to be paramount to their attendance at the university.

After a few years of paying the high costs of mass mailing, several universities are looking at other options. May have begun to include the policy with the registration packet all students receive. Inclusion in student handbooks is also a possibility. Dis-

tribution at required freshman orientation or other courses can cut costs if an institution can show that students actually received the information. For most schools, student e-mail is not an alternative, but it may be a distribution technique that can be used in the future, as long as it can be shown that all students receive the information. Finally, administrators can combine several distribution methods as long as it can be shown that every student receives a copy each year.

Getting students to read a policy is a completely different concern, as one East coast university discovered: one year, the AOD administrator distributed copies of the policy in mailboxes in campus residence halls and then observed what happened to the brochures over the next several hours. By actual physical count, over two-thirds of the brochure were tossed into the trash after students read only the title. The university had complied with the letter of the law by distributing the policy to each of the students. It had failed, however, in persuading them to read the information.

Administrators are finding that one way to interest students in reading the information is to summarize the policy and then refer students to the complete policy provided in the student handbook. The University of Delaware, for example, distributes a three-page letter to all students explaining the policy. If students want additional information, they may turn to their student handbook for answers. The AOD administrator believes that students will read a shortened version, and mailing costs are lower as well. Another university administrator found that bright colors, graphics, and short summaries of the information written in brochure form seemed to capture the students' attention best. A third school, not content with simply sending a letter to students, also includes information on eye-catching posters located in strategic points on campus. While the latter approach is not required, the AOD administrator believes that compliance with the spirit of the law means that everyone on campus sees and understands the university's commitment to

preventing AOD abuse.

Department of Education officials acknowledge the difficulty in ensuring that each student receives and understands the policy. Schools are encouraged to be creative and diligent in policy distribution. The key to compliance with this requirement is the ability to show a good-faith effort in reaching each and every student.

Biennial Review

The law requires a review of AOD programs and policies to be completed every two years. As a result, **schools should be preparing now for their third review, due in October, 1996.** The regulations do not spell out what a biennial review should include or how it should be conducted to allow flexibility to the unique circumstances of each campus. As a result, schools are given considerable leeway in determining what constitutes the biennial review.

Common sense dictates involving all campus segments or individuals who have immediate knowledge of the influence of any alcohol- and drug-related problems. And, of course, the president, if not personally involved, should have a representative at all meetings. The final report should be signed off and approved by the president. Depending on the campus, additional individuals to include on the review panel might be:

- student organizations (including fraternities and sororities);
- student services (including treatment or counseling services);
- student leaders (student government representatives, student newspaper editor, etc.);
- campus police;
- event organizers and planners;
- personnel or human services department;
- general counsel;
- key faculty, including faculty

senate members;

- selected administrators;
- high level administrators;
- employee organizations;
- public relations department;
- residential services personnel; and
- athletic department personnel.

The law requires only that schools review their policies and determine if sanctions are being consistently enforced. At a minimum, the report should describe the institution's measurement techniques (see below), discuss its prevention activities in detail to document the level of its activity, and document that appropriate campus people and departments are collaborating in the review of the program's impact.

The Secretary of Education encourages, but does not require, institutions to use objective measures that would allow a school to track use levels of alcohol and other drugs by students and employees. Schools may want to consider the use of other data collection measures, including:

- tracking the number of drug and alcohol-related disciplinary sanctions imposed;
- tracking the number of drug and alcohol-related referrals for counseling and treatment;
- tracking the number of drug and alcohol-related incidents recorded in the logs of campus police and other law enforcement agencies;
- tracking the number of drugs and alcohol-related incidents off vandalism; and
- tracking student, faculty, and employee attitudes and perceptions about drug and alcohol problems on campus.

For more information on the Drug-Free Schools and Campuses Act Regulations, contact the U.S. Department of Education, Drug Prevention Program, FIPSE, ROB 3, 7th and D Streets, SW, Washington, DC 20202-5175.

AOD Prevention Efforts at Historically Black Colleges and Universities

By **Betty Ward Fletcher, Ph.D.**
Dean, Graduate School,
Jackson State University,
and
Joel Epstein, J.D.
Higher Education Center

During the past decade, there has been a tremendous increase in awareness regarding alcohol and other drug use in higher education. This awareness has resulted in a corresponding increase in campus-based programs focused on the prevention of alcohol and other drug problems. The nature and extent of use is frequently related to the type of institution involved. In the view of many in the AOD prevention field, there are structural and community linkage differences at historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs), including the fact that most were born of religious origins that did not sanction the use of alcohol, that set them apart from other colleges and universities.

The overwhelming majority of African American students receive their baccalaureate education at one of the nation's 117 historically black colleges and universities. These institutions stand majestic symbols of excellence and citadels for the training and modeling of African American leadership. Any behavior which has the potential of mitigating the ability of HBCUs to continue their historic mission of educating African American students warrants careful analysis and swift intervention. The use of alcohol and other drugs by college-age African American students represents one such potentiality. Despite the increased awareness and proliferation of AOD prevention programs, the use of alcohol and other drugs continues to be a major concern at HBCUs as well as at other campuses.

The History of Drinking at HBCUs

Historically black colleges and universities have a clear responsibility to provide leadership in addressing the drug abuse problem. This responsibility is linked to the founding mission of most of these institutions, which have played a very critical role, in the shaping of American society. The mission of black institutions of higher education has always exceeded that of traditional academia. In addition to the primary role of educating, HBCUs and particularly private black colleges and universities, have served as the catalyst for social change. Collectively, these institutions have an established legacy of being responsive to the varied issues facing the African American community. Historically black Jackson State University in Jackson, Mississippi, is home to one of the oldest university alcohol and drug prevention centers in the country, dating from 1975.

The origins, early traditions, and social mores of black higher education mitigated against the use of alcohol and other drugs. The early African American leader and educator Booker T. Washington felt that character training for black students must be sanctioned by religion and stress sobriety and sexual restraint. Similarly, during the Nineteenth Century, many blacks were strong supporters of the American Temperance Movement, in part due to its close association with anti-slavery reform. Often these same organizations were also involved in the founding of black institutions of higher education and many of the founding groups for these schools were established religious organizations which also supported temperance. Atlanta University in Atlanta, Georgia, Fisk University in Nashville, Tennessee, Talladega College in Talladega, Alabama, and Tougaloo College in Tougaloo, Mississippi, are four southern institutions established by the American Missionary Association.

continued on page 6. . .

tion between 1865 and 1869. While a majority of HBCUs are not controlled by a religious denomination, almost two-thirds of the private black IHEs report a religious affiliation.

As a result of these historical linkages, the sanctioned institutionalized use of alcohol and other drugs as part of the social fabric of campus life at HBCUs, particularly the private institutions, has been less evident than on other campuses. For example, the alcohol-related behaviors which have historically characterized fraternity and sorority row on predominantly white campuses are not as common on black schools. Generally, campus pubs and group drinking competitions are less characteristic of HBCU campuses. These differences however, have not precluded the emergence of AOD problems at historically black colleges and universities. Instead many HBCU campuses are beginning to reflect the current values and practices in contemporary society that are characterized by a more tolerant orientation toward AOD use. Nonetheless, commercial outlets and sanctioned alcohol use as an accepted institutionalized part of college life lacks a historical precedent on HBCU campuses.

Current data indicate a difference in alcohol and other drug use by students from different ethnic groups. Specifically, according to the Core Alcohol and Drug Survey conducted among FIPSE funded institutions, the annual prevalence of alcohol use is lowest among black students, 72.7 percent (Presley, et al. 1995). Similarly, average weekly consumption was lowest among African American students.

According to Vivian Goon of Alcorn State University, a state-sponsored historically black university in Lorman, Mississippi, African American women tend to be the highest abstainers from AOD use.

Although these data are encouraging, caution is warranted. While use among African American colle-

gians may be lower than among other ethnic student groups, this does not mean that there are not serious alcohol/drug related problems on HBCU campuses.

More and more, the college campus, including the HBCU campus, is becoming a microcosm of alcohol and other drug related problems in the larger environment. Many students come to college with pre-existing alcohol and other drug related problems making the need for comprehensive campus-based programs essential.

Prevention Efforts at HBCUs

Programmatically, HBCUs face numerous challenges in the implementation of prevention and intervention programs. While a commitment from high-level school administrators is a necessary condition, a commitment alone is not sufficient. Equally important is the support and involvement of a core of individuals representative of the various units within the institution. The litmus test of high-level administrative commitment is the allocation of resources resulting in institutionalization of campus-based alcohol and other drug programs.

Representative of the types of AOD prevention services offered at HBCUs are those provided at New Orleans-based Xavier University of Louisiana. The Program for Alcohol and Drugs Education at Xavier (PADEX), together with the school's Counseling Center and Health Services provides alcohol and drug information, assessment, intervention, and referral services to students, faculty, and staff. Specifically, PADEX:

- provides information relevant to drug abuse and prevention, referral information, and a support system for Adult Children of Alcoholics;
- is available for the individual who is aware that his/her role performance is failing and is willing to seek help with a substance abuse problem;
- helps students and employees who are assessed as having a

substance abuse problem by their professors, advisors, or employers and are referred for intervention, referral information, or follow-up;

- will refer students assessed as having an alcohol or other drug problem to the appropriate service;
- will seek to make contact with students whose academic performance has declined and substance abuse is indicated or have been observed or otherwise detected abusing a drug; and
- receives referrals of students or employees involved in an accident in which drug use is detected.

HBCUs and the Community

The role of HBCUs in addressing alcohol and other drug problems extends beyond the campus proper. In light of their history, HBCUs tend to be an integral part of the larger African American communities in which they are located and serve as valuable community resources. Consequently, the linkage between the institution and the community in addressing the issue of alcohol and other drug use is often inseparable. Institutional and community collaboration represents a viable approach to addressing their issues.

Ben Robertson, Jr., Ph.D., Program Coordinator of Alcohol and Drug Education at Xavier University of Louisiana, warns that even if alcohol and other drug use is prevalent on many campuses throughout the country, a college's location in a city like New Orleans presents special challenges to AOD prevention staff. Dr. Robinson explains, "The message of excess permeates the entire city. In addition to Mardi Gras, the jazz festival held in April and other festivities encourage people to drink and party. A convoluted drinking age law in Louisiana also makes prevention a hard sell in New Orleans. In effect, the drinking age is 18 while the pur-

chase age is 21. The law dances around the federal law that tied a higher drinking age to federal highway funds.”

According to Robertson, school/community tensions are not trivial where a school seeks to promote an AOD-free campus in a community in which alcohol and other drugs are readily available. Additionally, he notes the need for strategies designed to prevent student from binge drinking after an exam and for dealing with second-hand drinking effects such as the damage done by rowdy and destructive students returning to campus drunk. Some at Xavier University also argue for making the transition from a school that tolerates alcohol at faculty and other events to an alcohol-free school.

Strategies for facilitating campus and community collaboration can be viewed within the framework of a community prevention model. The process of developing such a model is by far one of building relationships among individuals, families, agencies, organizations, and institutions of higher education. The first phase of developing a prevention program is initiating a community-wide effort that includes all segments of the community. It is at this level that crucial decisions related to defining the problem and crafting the response will be made. Therein lies the necessity of an inclusive process which recognizes alcohol and other drug abuse as the result of environmental as well as individual influences.

As noted above, Jackson State University has a long-standing and demonstrated commitment to this critical issue. The AOD prevention program at Jackson State University was initiated in 1974, prior to the current federal mandate. Jackson State University's Interdisciplinary Alcohol/Drug Studies Center serves as a university-wide coordinating unit for the provision of alcohol/drug and other programs in graduate education, research, prevention, intervention, and training. The graduate program prepares students for ca-

reers in counseling, and program planning. The educational program is under-girded by a strong research emphasis. Prevention and intervention are components of the campus-wide program available to faculty, staff, and students. Short-term training for such groups as school personnel, law enforcement, and human service providers is an on-going Center activity. The Interdisciplinary Alcohol/Drug Studies Center has also served as a model for program development and other HBCUs including Southern University at Baton Rouge, Morehouse College, and Tougaloo College.

Recognizing the deleterious effect of alcohol and other drugs on local communities, Jackson State Univer-

sity has assumed a leadership position in establishing a local community drug prevention partnership. The Jackson Takes a Stand Partnership focuses on mobilizing individuals, families, churches, and communities to address alcohol and other drug problems. This effort has resulted in a model for mobilizing residents of housing developments in AOD prevention.

While alcohol and other drug use is antithetical to the founding premise of many historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs), these institutions have not been shielded from such behavior. In a manner consistent with their historical posture, HBCUs have a critical role to play in

continued on page 8 . . .

Student Drinking Practices at HBCUs

Cheryl Presley of the University of Southern Illinois at Carbondale and her colleagues recently examined data from the Core Alcohol and Drug Survey to compare the drinking and other drug use (AOD) practices of students at traditionally black colleges with AOD use by black students at nonblack colleges. The study compared 14 historically black colleges (which used random sampling procedures for their Core survey) with 14 matched nonblack four-year institutions. The study examined 12,351 students, 6,222 at black institutions and 6,129 at non black institutions.

Here are some of the study's statistically significant findings. A full report will appear this winter in *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education*.

- Students at black schools consume smaller quantities of alcohol than white students, drink less often each week, and binge drink less frequently than students at nonblack colleges.
- Black students exhibit these patterns of reduced drinking

activity regardless of whether they are enrolled at black schools or nonblack schools—that is, black students enrolled at nonblack colleges still drink less than their nonwhite counterparts at these schools.

- Negative consequences from alcohol and other drug use are far less prevalent among students on black campuses than on nonblack campuses.

An unexpected finding from the survey is that white students attending black schools drink less alcohol and binge drink less frequently than do white students at nonblack schools.

For further information, contact to:

Cheryl Presley, Ph.D.
Executive Director
Core Institute
Center for Alcohol and Drug Studies
Student Health Program
Southern Illinois University
Carbondale, IL 62901
(618) 453-4366
fax (618) 453-4449

... continued from page 9

addressing alcohol and other drug use. The efforts of Jackson State University which span two decades, and other HBCUs, represent a proud example of how HBCUs have responded to this critical societal problem.

Nationwide Search for Promising Programs

The U.S. Department of Education, through the Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention, is conducting a nationwide search for promising prevention practices, strategies, and activities at institutions of higher education (IHEs). The most promising practices identified will be broadly disseminated through the Center's training, technical assistance, and

publications. Three programs will be eligible to work with the Center's senior evaluation staff to develop designs and funding strategies for rigorous outcome evaluation.

The department is interested in *all* types of prevention efforts but especially encourages nominations in the following areas: comprehensive, institutionwide programs designed to effect systemic change across the campus environment; programs to change the social climate and campus culture; programs that forge links with the surrounding community through coalitions, sponsored events, and other activities; and programs that make effective use of school policies. While alcohol is the most pervasive drug used by students, the department is also interested in programs that focus on preventing *other drug use*. The Center invites nominations from all IHEs and especially encourages commuter campus and two-year institutions to participate in this search for promising practices.

Further information on this

project is available on the Center's Worldwide Web site <http://www.edc.org/hec/>. Or contact

Edward De Vos, Ed.D.
Higher Education Center
55 Chapel Street
Newton, MA 02158-1060
telephone: (617) 969-7100
fax: (617) 969-5979
e-mail: HigherEdCtr@edc.org
toll-free: (800) 676-1730

CATALYST

is a publication of
The Higher Education Center for
Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention
funded by
the U.S. Department of Education.
(Publication No. ED/OESE94-14.)

*This newsletter was produced under
contract No. SS9-30-25-001. Views
expressed are those of the contractor.
No official support or endorsement by
the U.S. Department of Education
is intended or should be inferred.*



55 Chapel Street

Newton, MA 02158-0160

(800) 676-1730

Web site: <http://www.edc.org/hec/>